

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

EFRAIN NAJAS URIBE,

Petitioner

v.

JERRY HOWELL, et al.,

Respondents

Case No.: 2:21-cv-00054-RFB-BNW

ORDER

Efrain Najas Uribe has filed a pro se petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 and has now paid the filing fee (see ECF Nos. 1-1, 5). The court has reviewed the petition pursuant to Habeas Rule 4 and directs that it be served on respondents.

A petition for federal habeas corpus should include all claims for relief of which petitioner is aware. If petitioner fails to include such a claim in his petition, he may be forever barred from seeking federal habeas relief upon that claim. See 28 U.S.C. §2254(b) (successive petitions). If petitioner is aware of any claim not included in his petition, he should notify the court of that as soon as possible, perhaps by means of a motion to amend his petition to add the claim.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Clerk detach, file, and electronically SERVE the petition (ECF No. 1-1) on respondents.

1 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk add Aaron D. Ford, Nevada Attorney
2 General, as counsel for respondents and provide respondents an electronic copy of all
3 items previously filed in this case by regenerating the Notice of Electronic Filing to the
4 office of the AG only.

5 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that respondents file a response to the petition,
6 including potentially by motion to dismiss, within **90 days** of service of the petition, with
7 any requests for relief by petitioner by motion otherwise being subject to the normal
8 briefing schedule under the local rules. Any response filed is to comply with the
9 remaining provisions below, which are entered pursuant to Habeas Rule 5.

10 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that any procedural defenses raised by respondents
11 in this case be raised together in a single consolidated motion to dismiss. In other words,
12 the court does not wish to address any procedural defenses raised herein either in
13 seriatum fashion in multiple successive motions to dismiss or embedded in the answer.
14 Procedural defenses omitted from such motion to dismiss will be subject to potential
15 waiver. Respondents should not file a response in this case that consolidates their
16 procedural defenses, if any, with their response on the merits, except pursuant to 28
17 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(2) as to any unexhausted claims clearly lacking merit. If respondents
18 do seek dismissal of unexhausted claims under § 2254(b)(2): (a) they will do so within the
19 single motion to dismiss not in the answer; and (b) they will specifically direct their
20 argument to the standard for dismissal under § 2254(b)(2) set forth in Cassett v. Stewart,
21 406 F.3d 614, 623-24 (9th Cir. 2005). In short, no procedural defenses, including
22 exhaustion, should be included with the merits in an answer. All procedural defenses,
23 including exhaustion, instead must be raised by motion to dismiss.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any additional state court record exhibits filed herein by either petitioner or respondents be filed with a separate index of exhibits identifying the exhibits by number. The parties will identify filed CM/ECF attachments by the number or numbers of the exhibits in the attachment.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, at this time, the parties send courtesy copies of **any responsive pleading or motion and all INDICES OF EXHIBITS ONLY** to the Reno Division of this court. Courtesy copies shall be mailed to the Clerk of Court, 400 S. Virginia St., Reno, NV, 89501, and directed to the attention of “Staff Attorney” on the outside of the mailing address label. **No further courtesy copies are required unless and until requested by the court.**


RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE